Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
BIOLOGICAL				
*On Abundance of Target Species	Target species would continue to increase over time, probably as a result of continued access to feeding and loafing areas.	No significant impact. May reduce target species visitation to the landfill (short-term). Long-term population using [redacted] would remain at 30,000.	Potential negative impact. Potential to remove thousands (estimated 5,000) gulls annually. May reduce visitation (long-term) if ongoing.	Would reduce target species visitation and meet objective of near zero gull visitation to the working face. Potential annual removal of 600 gulls by [redacted] and WS.
*Federal/State Endangered and Threatened Species	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential positive impact off-site. Potential to increase threatened and endangered species diversity due to reduced interspecific competition for nesting space and gull nest predation.	Potential positive impact off-site.
CUMULATIVE				
* Gull Populations locally and Regionally	Gull populations would remain at current totals (estimated 30,000) or potentially increase.	Populations would remain at current levels (estimated 30,000). May increase if [redacted] is an important energy subsidy..	More than likely cumulatively suppress local gull populations. Local population impacts expected to be greater than regional.	Potential removal of a maximum of 400 gulls by [redacted] and 200 gulls by WS annually would have no cumulative impact.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
BIOLOGICAL				
*On Abundance of Target Species	Target species would continue to increase over time, probably as a result of continued access to feeding and loafing areas.	No significant impact. May reduce target species visitation to the landfill (short-term). Long-term population using [redacted] would remain at 30,000.	Potential negative impact. Potential to remove thousands (estimated 5,000) gulls annually. May reduce visitation (long-term) if ongoing.	Would reduce target species visitation and meet objective of near zero gull visitation to the working face. Potential annual removal of 600 gulls by [redacted] and WS.
*Federal/State Endangered and Threatened Species	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential positive impact off-site. Potential to increase threatened and endangered species diversity due to reduced interspecific competition for nesting space and gull nest predation.	Potential positive impact off-site.
CUMULATIVE				
* Gull Populations locally and Regionally	Gull populations would remain at current totals (estimated 30,000) or potentially increase.	Populations would remain at current levels (estimated 30,000). May increase if [redacted] is an important energy subsidy..	More than likely cumulatively suppress local gull populations. Local population impacts expected to be greater than regional.	Potential removal of a maximum of 400 gulls by [redacted] and 200 gulls by WS annually would have no cumulative impact.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
BIOLOGICAL				
*On Abundance of Target Species	Target species would continue to increase over time, probably as a result of continued access to feeding and loafing areas.	No significant impact. May reduce target species visitation to the landfill (short-term). Long-term population using [redacted] would remain at 30,000.	Potential negative impact. Potential to remove thousands (estimated 5,000) gulls annually. May reduce visitation (long-term) if ongoing.	Would reduce target species visitation and meet objective of near zero gull visitation to the working face. Potential annual removal of 600 gulls by [redacted] and WS.
*Federal/State Endangered and Threatened Species	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential positive impact off-site. Potential to increase threatened and endangered species diversity due to reduced interspecific competition for nesting space and gull nest predation.	Potential positive impact off-site.
CUMULATIVE				
* Gull Populations locally and Regionally	Gull populations would remain at current totals (estimated 30,000) or potentially increase.	Populations would remain at current levels (estimated 30,000). May increase if [redacted] is an important energy subsidy..	More than likely cumulatively suppress local gull populations. Local population impacts expected to be greater than regional.	Potential removal of a maximum of 400 gulls by [redacted] and 200 gulls by WS annually would have no cumulative impact.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
BIOLOGICAL				
*On Abundance of Target Species	Target species would continue to increase over time, probably as a result of continued access to feeding and loafing areas.	No significant impact. May reduce target species visitation to the landfill (short-term). Long-term population using [redacted] would remain at 30,000.	Potential negative impact. Potential to remove thousands (estimated 5,000) gulls annually. May reduce visitation (long-term) if ongoing.	Would reduce target species visitation and meet objective of near zero gull visitation to the working face. Potential annual removal of 600 gulls by [redacted] and WS.
*Federal/State Endangered and Threatened Species	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential positive impact off-site. Potential to increase threatened and endangered species diversity due to reduced interspecific competition for nesting space and gull nest predation.	Potential positive impact off-site.
CUMULATIVE				
* Gull Populations locally and Regionally	Gull populations would remain at current totals (estimated 30,000) or potentially increase.	Populations would remain at current levels (estimated 30,000). May increase if [redacted] is an important energy subsidy..	More than likely cumulatively suppress local gull populations. Local population impacts expected to be greater than regional.	Potential removal of a maximum of 400 gulls by [redacted] and 200 gulls by WS annually would have no cumulative impact.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
BIOLOGICAL				
*On Abundance of Target Species	Target species would continue to increase over time, probably as a result of continued access to feeding and loafing areas.	No significant impact. May reduce target species visitation to the landfill (short-term). Long-term population using [redacted] would remain at 30,000.	Potential negative impact. Potential to remove thousands (estimated 5,000) gulls annually. May reduce visitation (long-term) if ongoing.	Would reduce target species visitation and meet objective of near zero gull visitation to the working face. Potential annual removal of 600 gulls by [redacted] and WS.
*Federal/State Endangered and Threatened Species	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential positive impact off-site. Potential to increase threatened and endangered species diversity due to reduced interspecific competition for nesting space and gull nest predation.	Potential positive impact off-site.
CUMULATIVE				
* Gull Populations locally and Regionally	Gull populations would remain at current totals (estimated 30,000) or potentially increase.	Populations would remain at current levels (estimated 30,000). May increase if [redacted] is an important energy subsidy..	More than likely cumulatively suppress local gull populations. Local population impacts expected to be greater than regional.	Potential removal of a maximum of 400 gulls by [redacted] and 200 gulls by WS annually would have no cumulative impact.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
BIOLOGICAL				
*On Abundance of Target Species	Target species would continue to increase over time, probably as a result of continued access to feeding and loafing areas.	No significant impact. May reduce target species visitation to the landfill (short-term). Long-term population using [redacted] would remain at 30,000.	Potential negative impact. Potential to remove thousands (estimated 5,000) gulls annually. May reduce visitation (long-term) if ongoing.	Would reduce target species visitation and meet objective of near zero gull visitation to the working face. Potential annual removal of 600 gulls by [redacted] and WS.
*Federal/State Endangered and Threatened Species	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential negative impact off-site. Threatened and endangered species potential conflicts would continue at current levels or increase.	Potential positive impact off-site. Potential to increase threatened and endangered species diversity due to reduced interspecific competition for nesting space and gull nest predation.	Potential positive impact off-site.
CUMULATIVE				
* Gull Populations locally and Regionally	Gull populations would remain at current totals (estimated 30,000) or potentially increase.	Populations would remain at current levels (estimated 30,000). May increase if [redacted] is an important energy subsidy..	More than likely cumulatively suppress local gull populations. Local population impacts expected to be greater than regional.	Potential removal of a maximum of 400 gulls by [redacted] and 200 gulls by WS annually would have no cumulative impact.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS				
*Ecological Interest Groups	Would likely oppose this management option. No action would lead to continued increases in gull totals at the landfill and possibly adjacent areas.	Would approve of attempts to reduce gull visitation and associated problems. Generally would approve of non-lethal program.	Generally would not approve of lethal control program.	Would likely strongly favor this management option. Proactively addresses requirement to control disease vectors and greatest potential for reduces gull related problems.
*Animal Rights Groups	Would likely oppose this management option.	Would likely oppose these management actions. But, would likely find it the most acceptable alternative.	Would likely strongly oppose this management alternative. Generally strongly opposed to killing of wildlife for any reason.	Would likely oppose this management alternative. Generally not in favor of active wildlife management.
*General Public	Uninformed public not likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Public less likely to favor population reduction at [redacted]. Once informed still not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS				
*Ecological Interest Groups	Would likely oppose this management option. No action would lead to continued increases in gull totals at the landfill and possibly adjacent areas.	Would approve of attempts to reduce gull visitation and associated problems. Generally would approve of non-lethal program.	Generally would not approve of lethal control program.	Would likely strongly favor this management option. Proactively addresses requirement to control disease vectors and greatest potential for reduces gull related problems.
*Animal Rights Groups	Would likely oppose this management option.	Would likely oppose these management actions. But, would likely find it the most acceptable alternative.	Would likely strongly oppose this management alternative. Generally strongly opposed to killing of wildlife for any reason.	Would likely oppose this management alternative. Generally not in favor of active wildlife management.
*General Public	Uninformed public not likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Public less likely to favor population reduction at [redacted]. Once informed still not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS				
*Ecological Interest Groups	Would likely oppose this management option. No action would lead to continued increases in gull totals at the landfill and possibly adjacent areas.	Would approve of attempts to reduce gull visitation and associated problems. Generally would approve of non-lethal program.	Generally would not approve of lethal control program.	Would likely strongly favor this management option. Proactively addresses requirement to control disease vectors and greatest potential for reduces gull related problems.
*Animal Rights Groups	Would likely oppose this management option.	Would likely oppose these management actions. But, would likely find it the most acceptable alternative.	Would likely strongly oppose this management alternative. Generally strongly opposed to killing of wildlife for any reason.	Would likely oppose this management alternative. Generally not in favor of active wildlife management.
*General Public	Uninformed public not likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Public less likely to favor population reduction at [redacted]. Once informed still not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS				
*Ecological Interest Groups	Would likely oppose this management option. No action would lead to continued increases in gull totals at the landfill and possibly adjacent areas.	Would approve of attempts to reduce gull visitation and associated problems. Generally would approve of non-lethal program.	Generally would not approve of lethal control program.	Would likely strongly favor this management option. Proactively addresses requirement to control disease vectors and greatest potential for reduces gull related problems.
*Animal Rights Groups	Would likely oppose this management option.	Would likely oppose these management actions. But, would likely find it the most acceptable alternative.	Would likely strongly oppose this management alternative. Generally strongly opposed to killing of wildlife for any reason.	Would likely oppose this management alternative. Generally not in favor of active wildlife management.
*General Public	Uninformed public not likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Public less likely to favor population reduction at [redacted]. Once informed still not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS				
*Ecological Interest Groups	Would likely oppose this management option. No action would lead to continued increases in gull totals at the landfill and possibly adjacent areas.	Would approve of attempts to reduce gull visitation and associated problems. Generally would approve of non-lethal program.	Generally would not approve of lethal control program.	Would likely strongly favor this management option. Proactively addresses requirement to control disease vectors and greatest potential for reduces gull related problems.
*Animal Rights Groups	Would likely oppose this management option.	Would likely oppose these management actions. But, would likely find it the most acceptable alternative.	Would likely strongly oppose this management alternative. Generally strongly opposed to killing of wildlife for any reason.	Would likely oppose this management alternative. Generally not in favor of active wildlife management.
*General Public	Uninformed public not likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Public less likely to favor population reduction at [redacted]. Once informed still not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS				
*Ecological Interest Groups	Would likely oppose this management option. No action would lead to continued increases in gull totals at the landfill and possibly adjacent areas.	Would approve of attempts to reduce gull visitation and associated problems. Generally would approve of non-lethal program.	Generally would not approve of lethal control program.	Would likely strongly favor this management option. Proactively addresses requirement to control disease vectors and greatest potential for reduces gull related problems.
*Animal Rights Groups	Would likely oppose this management option.	Would likely oppose these management actions. But, would likely find it the most acceptable alternative.	Would likely strongly oppose this management alternative. Generally strongly opposed to killing of wildlife for any reason.	Would likely oppose this management alternative. Generally not in favor of active wildlife management.
*General Public	Uninformed public not likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative. Once informed; not likely to favor this alternative.	Public less likely to favor population reduction at [redacted]. Once informed still not likely to favor this alternative.	Uninformed public likely to favor this alternative.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
*Landfill and Clients	Continue increased costs to maintain and repair landfill and client equipment from excessive gull droppings. Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls will visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs (short-term). Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls could visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs. Reduced number gulls and may reduce negative foraging impacts to buildings, equipment or other property.	Greatest potential for reducing long-term economic costs associated with large concentrations of gulls to landfill, clients and neighbors.
*Human Health and Safety Avoided, Airports and Loss/Risks Reduced	Greatest potential for landfill employee and client accidents and population expansion of target species could result in gull related hazards at airports. Increased likelihood of human and animal contact with bird feces and potential diseases.	Continued long-term potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential short-term positive impact. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics.	Continued potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential long-term positive impact.	Long-term increased safety of daily landfill operational activities. Reduced potential for safety hazards and disease transmission. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics. Monitor potential increase gull activity at area airports.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
*Landfill and Clients	Continue increased costs to maintain and repair landfill and client equipment from excessive gull droppings. Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls will visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs (short-term). Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls could visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs. Reduced number gulls and may reduce negative foraging impacts to buildings, equipment or other property.	Greatest potential for reducing long-term economic costs associated with large concentrations of gulls to landfill, clients and neighbors.
*Human Health and Safety Avoided, Airports and Loss/Risks Reduced	Greatest potential for landfill employee and client accidents and population expansion of target species could result in gull related hazards at airports. Increased likelihood of human and animal contact with bird feces and potential diseases.	Continued long-term potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential short-term positive impact. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics.	Continued potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential long-term positive impact.	Long-term increased safety of daily landfill operational activities. Reduced potential for safety hazards and disease transmission. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics. Monitor potential increase gull activity at area airports.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
*Landfill and Clients	Continue increased costs to maintain and repair landfill and client equipment from excessive gull droppings. Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls will visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs (short-term). Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls could visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs. Reduced number gulls and may reduce negative foraging impacts to buildings, equipment or other property.	Greatest potential for reducing long-term economic costs associated with large concentrations of gulls to landfill, clients and neighbors.
*Human Health and Safety Avoided, Airports and Loss/Risks Reduced	Greatest potential for landfill employee and client accidents and population expansion of target species could result in gull related hazards at airports. Increased likelihood of human and animal contact with bird feces and potential diseases.	Continued long-term potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential short-term positive impact. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics.	Continued potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential long-term positive impact.	Long-term increased safety of daily landfill operational activities. Reduced potential for safety hazards and disease transmission. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics. Monitor potential increase gull activity at area airports.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
*Landfill and Clients	Continue increased costs to maintain and repair landfill and client equipment from excessive gull droppings. Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls will visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs (short-term). Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls could visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs. Reduced number gulls and may reduce negative foraging impacts to buildings, equipment or other property.	Greatest potential for reducing long-term economic costs associated with large concentrations of gulls to landfill, clients and neighbors.
*Human Health and Safety Avoided, Airports and Loss/Risks Reduced	Greatest potential for landfill employee and client accidents and population expansion of target species could result in gull related hazards at airports. Increased likelihood of human and animal contact with bird feces and potential diseases.	Continued long-term potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential short-term positive impact. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics.	Continued potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential long-term positive impact.	Long-term increased safety of daily landfill operational activities. Reduced potential for safety hazards and disease transmission. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics. Monitor potential increase gull activity at area airports.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
*Landfill and Clients	Continue increased costs to maintain and repair landfill and client equipment from excessive gull droppings. Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls will visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs (short-term). Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls could visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs. Reduced number gulls and may reduce negative foraging impacts to buildings, equipment or other property.	Greatest potential for reducing long-term economic costs associated with large concentrations of gulls to landfill, clients and neighbors.
*Human Health and Safety Avoided, Airports and Loss/Risks Reduced	Greatest potential for landfill employee and client accidents and population expansion of target species could result in gull related hazards at airports. Increased likelihood of human and animal contact with bird feces and potential diseases.	Continued long-term potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential short-term positive impact. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics.	Continued potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential long-term positive impact.	Long-term increased safety of daily landfill operational activities. Reduced potential for safety hazards and disease transmission. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics. Monitor potential increase gull activity at area airports.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
*Landfill and Clients	Continue increased costs to maintain and repair landfill and client equipment from excessive gull droppings. Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls will visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs (short-term). Greater number of foraging and roosting gulls could visit adjacent sites and may negatively impact buildings, equipment or other property.	May reduce equipment maintenance and repair costs. Reduced number gulls and may reduce negative foraging impacts to buildings, equipment or other property.	Greatest potential for reducing long-term economic costs associated with large concentrations of gulls to landfill, clients and neighbors.
*Human Health and Safety Avoided, Airports and Loss/Risks Reduced	Greatest potential for landfill employee and client accidents and population expansion of target species could result in gull related hazards at airports. Increased likelihood of human and animal contact with bird feces and potential diseases.	Continued long-term potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential short-term positive impact. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics.	Continued potential for accidents, airport issue hazards and disease transmission. Potential long-term positive impact.	Long-term increased safety of daily landfill operational activities. Reduced potential for safety hazards and disease transmission. Potential safety concerns from erratic pyrotechnics. Monitor potential increase gull activity at area airports.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS (continued)				
*Adjacent and Area Landowners	Would likely oppose this alternative. Continued potential for negative impacts on adjacent buildings and properties.	Would likely favor this alternative over the no action alternative, but would prefer a more aggressive approach.	Would likely oppose this management alternative given projected effectiveness of Alternative 4.	Would likely strongly favor this alternative as an acceptable long-term means to reduce gull visitation.
Aesthetics	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	May distress individuals who have established affectionate bonds with individual gulls. Natural environment viewing potential may be impacted.	Potential to view gulls in natural environment not impacted. May impact individuals with affectionate bonds.
PHYSICAL IMPACTS				
*Water (surface and ground)	Potential for increased long-term negative impacts related to fecal contamination of standing water on facility. Potential for fecal contamination of local water supplies.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term). Long-term potential remains.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term).	Reduced long-term potential for contamination of local water supplies and standing water at the facility.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS (continued)				
*Adjacent and Area Landowners	Would likely oppose this alternative. Continued potential for negative impacts on adjacent buildings and properties.	Would likely favor this alternative over the no action alternative, but would prefer a more aggressive approach.	Would likely oppose this management alternative given projected effectiveness of Alternative 4.	Would likely strongly favor this alternative as an acceptable long-term means to reduce gull visitation.
Aesthetics	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	May distress individuals who have established affectionate bonds with individual gulls. Natural environment viewing potential may be impacted.	Potential to view gulls in natural environment not impacted. May impact individuals with affectionate bonds.
PHYSICAL IMPACTS				
*Water (surface and ground)	Potential for increased long-term negative impacts related to fecal contamination of standing water on facility. Potential for fecal contamination of local water supplies.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term). Long-term potential remains.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term).	Reduced long-term potential for contamination of local water supplies and standing water at the facility.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS (continued)				
*Adjacent and Area Landowners	Would likely oppose this alternative. Continued potential for negative impacts on adjacent buildings and properties.	Would likely favor this alternative over the no action alternative, but would prefer a more aggressive approach.	Would likely oppose this management alternative given projected effectiveness of Alternative 4.	Would likely strongly favor this alternative as an acceptable long-term means to reduce gull visitation.
Aesthetics	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	May distress individuals who have established affectionate bonds with individual gulls. Natural environment viewing potential may be impacted.	Potential to view gulls in natural environment not impacted. May impact individuals with affectionate bonds.
PHYSICAL IMPACTS				
*Water (surface and ground)	Potential for increased long-term negative impacts related to fecal contamination of standing water on facility. Potential for fecal contamination of local water supplies.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term). Long-term potential remains.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term).	Reduced long-term potential for contamination of local water supplies and standing water at the facility.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS (continued)				
*Adjacent and Area Landowners	Would likely oppose this alternative. Continued potential for negative impacts on adjacent buildings and properties.	Would likely favor this alternative over the no action alternative, but would prefer a more aggressive approach.	Would likely oppose this management alternative given projected effectiveness of Alternative 4.	Would likely strongly favor this alternative as an acceptable long-term means to reduce gull visitation.
Aesthetics	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	May distress individuals who have established affectionate bonds with individual gulls. Natural environment viewing potential may be impacted.	Potential to view gulls in natural environment not impacted. May impact individuals with affectionate bonds.
PHYSICAL IMPACTS				
*Water (surface and ground)	Potential for increased long-term negative impacts related to fecal contamination of standing water on facility. Potential for fecal contamination of local water supplies.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term). Long-term potential remains.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term).	Reduced long-term potential for contamination of local water supplies and standing water at the facility.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS (continued)				
*Adjacent and Area Landowners	Would likely oppose this alternative. Continued potential for negative impacts on adjacent buildings and properties.	Would likely favor this alternative over the no action alternative, but would prefer a more aggressive approach.	Would likely oppose this management alternative given projected effectiveness of Alternative 4.	Would likely strongly favor this alternative as an acceptable long-term means to reduce gull visitation.
Aesthetics	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	May distress individuals who have established affectionate bonds with individual gulls. Natural environment viewing potential may be impacted.	Potential to view gulls in natural environment not impacted. May impact individuals with affectionate bonds.
PHYSICAL IMPACTS				
*Water (surface and ground)	Potential for increased long-term negative impacts related to fecal contamination of standing water on facility. Potential for fecal contamination of local water supplies.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term). Long-term potential remains.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term).	Reduced long-term potential for contamination of local water supplies and standing water at the facility.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION)	ALTERNATIVE 2 (NON-LETHAL)	ALTERNATIVE 3 (LOCAL GULL POP. SUPPRESSION)	ALTERNATIVE 4 (INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT)
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS (continued)				
*Adjacent and Area Landowners	Would likely oppose this alternative. Continued potential for negative impacts on adjacent buildings and properties.	Would likely favor this alternative over the no action alternative, but would prefer a more aggressive approach.	Would likely oppose this management alternative given projected effectiveness of Alternative 4.	Would likely strongly favor this alternative as an acceptable long-term means to reduce gull visitation.
Aesthetics	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	Gulls would still be able to be viewed in their natural environment.	May distress individuals who have established affectionate bonds with individual gulls. Natural environment viewing potential may be impacted.	Potential to view gulls in natural environment not impacted. May impact individuals with affectionate bonds.
PHYSICAL IMPACTS				
*Water (surface and ground)	Potential for increased long-term negative impacts related to fecal contamination of standing water on facility. Potential for fecal contamination of local water supplies.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term). Long-term potential remains.	May reduce fecal water contamination impacts (short-term).	Reduced long-term potential for contamination of local water supplies and standing water at the facility.

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)

Table 2. A Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives Considered in this Environmental Assessment (target species are Herring, Great black-backed and Ring-billed gulls)